

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 05-03096-01-CR-S-RED
	)	
JULIO M. LOPEZ,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

Defendant has filed three pro se motions. They are a motion to dismiss (Doc. 216); a supplemental Motion to Dismiss (Doc. 240), and a Motion for Disclosure of Impeaching Information.

Defendant is represented by counsel Ms. Michelle Law. The scheduling and trial order entered in this case on August 11, 2005, (Doc. 172) provides “pro se pleadings will not be accepted for defendants who are represented by counsel,” Section VI. A. p.7. The District Court “has no obligation to entertain pro se motions filed by a represented party.” *United States v. Hale*, 978 F.2d 1016, 1018, n.2 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982); *United States v. Blum*, 65 F.3d 1436, 1443, n.2 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1995) and *Abdullah v. United States*, 2240 F.3d 683, 686 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2001). It is further noted that defendant’s counsel has notice of the pretrial motions through the clerk’s notice of electronic filing.<sup>1</sup> It is therefore

---

<sup>1</sup> The Motions to Dismiss have no legal basis. This is an open file discovery which obviates the need for the remaining pro se motion.

ORDERED that defendant's pro se motions be denied without prejudice..

/s/ James C. England  
JAMES C. ENGLAND, Chief  
United States Magistrate Judge

Date: January 9, 2006